

rather than an economic or a transportation decision. vania, and the New York Central to consolidate.

The I.C.C. examiners, in their report last March, limited the responsibility of the merged railroads toward the New Haven to taking over its freight business. Their objective was to further the cause of creating a railroad system strong enough to stand on its own feet against the competition of all other forms of transportation.

The compromise proposed by New York's political leaders—with the notable exception of Governor Rockefeller—would ill serve the two main purposes involved. It would damage the viability of the merged system, and hence undermine the general economic welfare of the Northeast. While it would temporarily retain commuter service within the scope of private enterprise, a stepchild passenger operation forced upon the Pennsylvania and New York Central only by political coercion would be at best a minimum, indifferent, unsatisfactory service. Is that what New York and its suburbs want?

The public interest lies in Governor Rockefeller's plan to bring commuter service under Government control, in cooperation with Connecticut. Thus, and only thus, can the states be master of commuter rail service for the future. That is the policy, in somewhat different form, that put the Port Authority in command of trans-Hudson rail service. It is the policy responsible for purchase of the Long Island Rail Road. It is the only policy that guarantees completely integrated metropolitan rail transportation.

Unless the states take control, commuter service into New York City will worry along on a subsistence level, if at all. And that is not good enough.

### ...and Supervising the C.I.A.

Continuing Congressional distrust of the Central Intelligence Agency has been most recently reflected in the resolutions submitted by Senators McCarthy and Young. The former proposes a Senate investigation of the C.I.A.'s impact on United States foreign relations, while the latter advocates a Senate-House "watchdog" committee on the C.I.A. analogous to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The demand for closer Congressional control of the C.I.A. arises not only from the spectacular fiascos in which it has been involved during the last few years but even more particularly from charges that the C.I.A. sometimes goes beyond the gathering and evaluating of intelligence to the actual formation of policy affecting foreign relations.

Intelligence agencies traditionally oppose legislative supervision for fear of compromising the secrecy their work requires. But we have felt—and said—for years that the Congressional reins have been far too lightly held, the existing means of control so inadequate as to be almost useless. We still believe the C.I.A. and the rest of the intelligence community would benefit by creation of a permanent joint Congressional watchdog committee over the entire national intelligence effort.

### Scientific Pork Barrel

The eminent Soviet physicist P. L. Kapitsa has published an article acknowledging that American science is still contributing far more to mankind's knowledge than is its Soviet counterpart. He attributes the United States lead largely to the winner American technique for Government subsidy of research. Washington, he points out, has usually distributed money on the basis of the quality of the researcher and the merit of the project proposed rather than, as in Moscow, by allocating funds directly to institutions.

Ironically, several months ago President Johnson announced a change in policy that will tend to move the American practice toward the Soviet pattern. In a statement to the Cabinet the President directed

to the need, a Chicago police official testified that a recent study revealed that of four thousand purchasers of firearms through the mail in his city, nearly 25 per cent had arrest records.

As for the effectiveness of gun regulations, James V. Bennett, former chief of the United States Bureau of Prisons, has frequently pointed out that cities which have such regulations have substantially lower homicide rates than cities which do not. Police officials know that many murders are crimes of passion—committed on impulse and regretted almost immediately. Mr. Bennett has observed: "I am personally convinced that many of these crimes would not have been committed, and many of these men would not have come to prison, if guns had not been so easily available."

In response to testimony in last year's hearings, Senator Dodd has revised his bill to prevent hardships for antique gun collectors and to make it easier for stores in remote areas to stock ammunition for hunters. Having met these objections, he is right to press for prompt action. The profitable but evil trade in mail-order firearms has flourished too long.

### Election at Hull

The British by-election tomorrow at Hull on the Yorkshire coast has become of national importance. In the 1964 general election, Labor's majority was only 1,181, with nearly 48,000 people voting. Theoretically, a swing of 600 votes away from Labor would bring victory to the Conservative candidate and reduce Prime Minister Wilson's majority in the House of Commons to one. Such a result could force Mr. Wilson into a general election before he wanted it.

The man who can upset the Socialist apple cart is a pacifist journalist named Richard Gott. He is against the Labor Government's support of the Vietnamese war and is seeking to draw enough votes away from Kevin McNamara, the Laborite candidate, to defeat him on that single issue. The situation makes little sense, because the Tories and Liberals do not disagree with the Government's policy toward Vietnam, so Mr. Gott has little to gain except attention for his cause.

Mr. Gott's position is eccentric, and very British; but the real issues in the by-election are not Vietnam or Richard Gott. They are the performance of the Labor Government to date; the party machinery which got caught napping and swung into the Hull campaign very late; the divisions in the Conservative party which are making life difficult for Edward Heath, Leader of the Opposition; the uncertain fate of the Liberals, whose able and popular leader, Jo Grimond, is retiring. Very much in the minds of the voters will be the slow but steady inflation, the Government's policy of keeping wages and prices down, fear of increased taxes, the threatened national railway strike next month, the fuel crisis, the housing slump.

Mr. Heath's party, disunited and without a coherent policy structure, badly needs a victory in Hull. The curious fact is that if Toby Jessel, the Tory candidate, wins, it will probably be because a small number of voters deserted the Labor and Liberal parties for a maverick named Richard Gott.

### Man, the Endangered Species

If man refuses to follow wise conservation practices in controlling his economic affairs, the ultimate victim may be not natural beauty or birds and fish but man himself. This is the sober warning of Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall in his recent report on the various species of fish, birds and animals that are close to extinction.

Secretary Udall points out that "every species, being unique, may prove essential in current and future

### Foreign Affairs

By C. L. SULZBERGER

PARIS Although the aims and methods of France and its allies today seem incompatible, General de Gaulle will ultimately decide not to withdraw France from either NATO or the Common Market. This is the judgment of Dirk Stikker, the Dutch statesman who until last year was Secretary General of NATO. The judgment appears in Stikker's memoirs, to be published Monday by Harper & Row.

Despite a rather optimistic conclusion, however, Stikker makes clear his deep unhappiness with French policy. He chides France for being "more disturbing than helpful" in all of the recent Western crises—Berlin; Cuba, Cyprus and Vietnam. He contends:

**Stikker's View**

"The present personal regime in France, preoccupied with the grandeur and mission of France but without any real power to support this illusion, can only resort to a deliberate display to both friends and foes of 'complete independence.' This vaunted 'complete independence' of action has created an atmosphere of incompatibility of both aims and methods between France and nearly all of its allies ...

### Letter

#### Vote on U.N. Seating of Communist China

To the Editor:

Your editorial remarks [Jan. 17 "Keeping Taiwan in the U. N."] on the legal analysis in Alexander W. Rudzinski's letter of the same date prompt the following comment concerning the Chinese representation issue in the General Assembly. Mr. Rudzinski argues that the question of Peking's admission can be decided by a simple majority vote. My view is that sound interpretation of Article 18 of the U.N. Charter requires that a decision to deny to ten million Taiwanese people the right freely to choose U.N. representation be taken by a two-thirds majority of the Assembly.

The position of the United States in the Security Council in January 1950—cited by Mr. Rudzinski as a precedent—has no legal relevance to the application of Article 18 in the Assembly. All members of the Council—except the highly respected Chinese delegate, Dr. T. T. Tsiang—agreed that the Soviet proposal to invalidate his credentials presented a procedural question.

#### Council Decisions

The Charter (Article 27) provides that Council decisions on "procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members." The soundness in principle and the practical prudence of the United States position were manifest in July 1962, when Dr. Tsiang was succeeded by the very able Ambassador Lau. No Council member suggested at that time that the latter's accreditation was